

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

USA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MAURICE LIGE,

Defendant.

Case No. [17-cr-00102-RS-1](#) (JSC)

ORDER OF DETENTION

Defendant Maurice Lige is charged by indictment with violating 18 U.S.C. § 922(g). Mr. Gerarden came before the Court on April 24, 2017 for a detention hearing. At his detention hearing on March 7, 2017, he waived the hearing and formal findings as to detention without prejudice. The matter came again before the Court on April 28, 2017, for a detention hearing. The defendant was present and represented by Elizabeth Falk of the Federal Public Defender's Office. Assistant United States Attorney Scott Joiner appeared for the Government.

Prior to the March 7, 2017 hearing, Pretrial Services submitted a report that recommended detention. Before the hearing on April 28, 2017, Pretrial Services amended the report to identify additional sureties and recommended release with conditions. A representative of Pretrial Services was present at the April 28, 2017 hearing. The Government moved for detention. Defendant opposed. Proffers and arguments regarding detention were submitted by the parties at the hearing.

Upon consideration of the facts, proffers and arguments presented, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Court finds by clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of other persons and the community. The sureties proffered by the defendant, who were present at the hearing and examined by the Court on the record, do not mitigate the danger to the community posed by the defendant.

The present order supplements the Court's findings and order at the detention hearing and

1 serves as written findings of fact and a statement of reasons as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i)(1).
2 As noted on the record, the Court makes the following findings as a basis for its conclusion that no
3 condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of other persons and the
4 community as to Defendant Lige.

5 The defendant's criminal history began at a young age and includes violent crimes. The
6 defendant admits that he is a documented gang member. At the time of his most recent arrest, the
7 defendant was on parole for robbery. His robbery conviction followed his arrest in connection
8 with the murder of a San Francisco tourist, although the Court accepts the proffer that the did not
9 use the gun in that incident.

10 The Government proffered facts regarding the current charges indicating that the defendant
11 was contacted by San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) officers on October 29, 2016. The
12 officers had received information that led them to believe that Lige was a felon in possession of a
13 firearm. When the officers identified themselves and contacted Lige, he fled. The officers gave
14 chase on foot. During his flight, Lige jumped several fences and was able to elude the officers
15 after he crossed into a construction site. Additional officers responded to the scene and set-up a
16 perimeter around the construction site. Lige was located as he was hiding underneath a large
17 construction truck that was parked within the construction site. He was taken into custody but was
18 not in possession of a firearm. Officers backtracked along Lige's path and located a firearm lying
19 on the ground between two of the fences Lige had scaled. The firearm was determined to be a
20 Glock 22, .40-caliber semi-automatic pistol. It had a 22 round extended magazine, loaded with 16
21 .40 caliber bullets. Defendant was subsequently indicted for possession of that firearm.

22 The government also proffered the following facts about the defendant's arrest on federal
23 charges. On March 1, 2017, federal agents attempted to arrest Lige at San Francisco Superior
24 Court during one of his regularly scheduled court appearances. Lige failed to appear. Later that
25 afternoon, SFPD officers located Lige near where he had been arrested with the firearm in October
26 2016. Lige again fled from the officers. He was arrested after a short pursuit.

27 The Court is not satisfied that the proposed sureties and proposed living situation for
28 Defendant can sufficiently mitigate the danger to the community presented.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), IT IS ORDERED THAT:

3. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the government, the person in charge of the corrections facility in which the defendant is confined shall deliver the defendant to an authorized United States marshal for the purpose of any appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Dated: May 5, 2017

Jacqueline Scott Corley
JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States Magistrate Judge